arXiv:1512.04248v1 [math.AG] 14 Dec 2015

NON-COMPACT NEWTON BOUNDARY AND WHITNEY EQUISINGULARITY FOR NON-ISOLATED SINGULARITIES

CHRISTOPHE EYRAL AND MUTSUO OKA

ABSTRACT. In an unpublished lecture note, J. Briançon observed that if $\{f_t\}$ is a family of isolated complex hypersurface singularities such that the Newton boundary of f_t is independent of t and f_t is non-degenerate, then the corresponding family of hypersurfaces $\{f_t^{-1}(0)\}$ is Whitney equisingular (and hence topologically equisingular). A first generalization of this assertion to families with non-isolated singularities was given by the second author under a rather technical condition. In the present paper, we give a new generalization under a simpler condition.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $(t,\mathbf{z}) := (t,z_1,\ldots,z_n)$ be coordinates for $\mathbb{C}\times\mathbb{C}^n$, let U be an open neighbourhood of $\mathbf{0}\in\mathbb{C}^n$ and D be an open disc centered at $0\in\mathbb{C}$; finally, let

$$f\colon (D\times U, D\times\{\mathbf{0}\})\to(\mathbb{C},0),\ (t,\mathbf{z})\mapsto f(t,\mathbf{z}),$$

be a polynomial function. As usual, we write $f_t(\mathbf{z}) := f(t,\mathbf{z})$ and we denote by $V(f_t)$ the hypersurface in $U\subseteq\mathbb{C}^n$ defined by f_t. We are interested in the local structure of the singular loci of the hypersurfaces $V(f_t)$ at the origin $\mathbf{0}\in\mathbb{C}^n$ as the parameter t varies from a "small" non-zero value $t_0\neq 0$ to $t=0$. More precisely, we are looking for easy-to-check conditions on the members f_t of the family $\{f_t\}$ that guarantee equisingularity (in a sense to be specified) for the corresponding family of hypersurfaces $\{V(f_t)\}$.

In an unpublished lecture note [1], J. Briançon made the following observation.

Assertion 1.1 (Briançon)**.** *Suppose that for all t sufficiently small, the following three conditions are satisfied:*

(1) *f_t has an isolated singularity at the origin $\mathbf{0}\in\mathbb{C}^n$;*
(2) *the Newton boundary $\Gamma(f_t;\mathbf{z})$ of f_t at $\mathbf{0}$ with respect to the coordinates $\mathbf{z}$ is independent of t;*
(3) *f_t is non-degenerate (in the sense of the Newton boundary as in [3,6]).*

Then the family of hypersurfaces $\{V(f_t)\}$ is Whitney equisingular.

We say that a family $\{V(f_t)\}$ of (possibly non-isolated) hypersurface singularities is *Whitney equisingular* if there exist a Whitney stratification of the hypersurface $V(f) := f^{-1}(0)$ in an open neighbourhood $\mathscr{U}$ of the origin $(0,\mathbf{0})\in\mathbb{C}\times\mathbb{C}^n$ such that the t-axis $\mathscr{U}\cap(D\times\{\mathbf{0}\})$ is a stratum. By "Whitney stratification" we mean a Whitney stratification in the sense of [2]—that is, we do not require that the frontier condition holds. However, note that if $\mathscr{S}$ is Whitney stratification of

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 14J70, 14J17, 32S15, 32S25.

Key words and phrases. Non-isolated hypersurface singularities; non-compact Newton boundary; uniform local tameness; Whitney equisingularity.

$\mathscr{U} \cap V(f)$ with the t-axis as a stratum, then so is the partition $\mathscr{S}^c$ consisting of the connected components of the strata of $\mathscr{S}$; moreover, $\mathscr{S}^c$ satisfies the frontier condition (see [2] for details). Whitney equisingularity is quite a strong form of equisingularity. Combined with the Thom-Mather first isotopy theorem (cf. [2,4,12]), it implies topological equisingularity. Here, we say that the family $\{V(f_t)\}$ is *topologically equisingular* if for all sufficiently small t, there is an open neighbourhood $U_t \subseteq U$ of $\mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ together with a homeomorphism $\varphi_t \colon (U_t, \mathbf{0}) \to (\varphi_t(U_t), \mathbf{0})$ such that $\varphi_t(V(f_0) \cap U_t) = V(f_t) \cap \varphi_t(U_t)$. Note that a family of *isolated* hypersurface singularities (as in Assertion 1.1) is Whitney equisingular if and only if $V(f) \setminus (D \times \{\mathbf{0}\})$ is smooth and Whitney (b)-regular over $D \times \{\mathbf{0}\}$ in an open neighbourhood of the origin in $\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}^n$. Here, it is worth to observe that, in general, even if the smooth part of $V(f)$ is Whitney (b)-regular along the t-axis, the family of hypersurfaces $\{V(f_t)\}$ may fail to be topologically equisingular. The simplest example illustrating this phenomenon is due to O. Zariski [13] and is as follows. Consider the family defined by the polynomial function $f(t,z_1,z_2) := t^2 z_1^2 - z_2^2$. The singular locus of $V(f)$ consists of two lines, namely the t-axis and the z_1-axis. Clearly, the smooth part of $V(f)$ is Whitney (b)-regular along the t-axis. However, there is no local ambient homeomorphism sending $(V(f_0), \mathbf{0})$ onto $(V(f_t), \mathbf{0})$.

To conclude with Assertion 1.1, let us mention that its proof is based on a famous theorem due to A. G. Kouchnirenko [3] and the second author [6]. This theorem says that if $h(\mathbf{z})$ is a non-degenerate polynomial function with an isolated singularity at $\mathbf{0}$, then its Milnor fibration and its Milnor number at $\mathbf{0}$, as well as the local ambient topological type of the corresponding hypersurface $V(h)$ at $\mathbf{0}$, are determined by the Newton boundary $\Gamma(h;\mathbf{z})$ of h at $\mathbf{0}$ with respect to the coordinates $\mathbf{z}$.

In [8], the second author gave a generalization of Briançon's assertion to families of *non-isolated* singularities under a relatively technical condition (so-called "simultaneous IND-condition"). Essentially, the technical nature of this condition comes the fact that, in [8], the question of Whitney equisingularity is treated in the general framework of complete intersection varieties. In the present paper, we restrict ourselves to the case of hypersurfaces, and we give a new generalization under a rather simple condition. As in [8], when dealing with non-isolated singularities, we need to consider not only the compact faces of the Newton polygon (i.e., the faces involved in the usual Newton boundary) but also "essential" non-compact faces. The union of the compact and essential non-compact faces forms the *non-compact Newton boundary*, which was considered not only in [8] but also in [11] to study the Milnor fibration and some geometric properties such as Thom's condition or the transversality of the nearby fibres of a polynomial function $h(\mathbf{z})$ with non-isolated singularities. (Actually, in [11], the second author investigated the Milnor fibration and the Thom condition in the more general case of a "mixed" polynomial function $h(\mathbf{z},\overline{\mathbf{z}})$.) A crucial ingredient, introduced in [11], to handle the essential non-compact faces is the "local tameness." We shall see below that the local tameness—more precisely, a uniform version in t of the local tameness—also plays a key role in our generalization of Briançon's assertion.

2. Non-compact Newton boundary and local tameness

In this section, we recall important definitions—due to A. G. Kouchnirenko [3] and the second author [6, 11]—that will be used in this paper. A special emphasis

will be given to the "local tameness" introduced by the second author in [11] and which will be crucial for our purpose.

Let $\mathbf{z} := (z_1, \ldots, z_n)$ be coordinates for $\mathbb{C}^n$, let U be an open neighbourhood of the origin $\mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{C}^n$, and let

$$h\colon (U, \mathbf{0}) \to (\mathbb{C}, 0),\ \mathbf{z} \mapsto h(\mathbf{z}) = \sum_{\alpha} c_\alpha \mathbf{z}^\alpha$$

be a polynomial function, where $\alpha := (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$, $c_\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\mathbf{z}^\alpha := z_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots z_n^{\alpha_n}$. As usual, we write $V(h)$ for the hypersurface in $U \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$ defined by h. For any subset $I \subseteq \{1, \ldots, n\}$, we set

$$\mathbb{C}^I := \{(z_1, \ldots, z_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n\ ;\ z_i = 0 \text{ if } i \notin I\},$$
$$\mathbb{C}^{*I} := \{(z_1, \ldots, z_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n\ ;\ z_i = 0 \text{ if and only if } i \notin I\}.$$

In particular, $\mathbb{C}^\emptyset = \mathbb{C}^{*\emptyset} = \{\mathbf{0}\}$ and $\mathbb{C}^{*\{1,\ldots,n\}} = (\mathbb{C}^*)^n$. (As usual, $\mathbb{C}^* := \mathbb{C} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$.)

The *Newton polygon* of h at $\mathbf{0}$ with respect to the coordinates $\mathbf{z}$ (denoted by $\Gamma_+(h;\mathbf{z})$) is the convex hull in $\mathbb{R}^n_+$ of the set

$$\bigcup_{c_\alpha \neq 0} (\alpha + \mathbb{R}^n_+),$$

where $\mathbb{R}^n_+ = \{\mathbf{x} := (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n\ ;\ x_i \geq 0 \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq n\}$. The *Newton boundary* of h at $\mathbf{0}$ with respect to $\mathbf{z}$ (denoted by $\Gamma(h;\mathbf{z})$) is the union of the compact faces of $\Gamma_+(h;\mathbf{z})$. For any system of weights $\mathbf{w} := (w_1, \ldots, w_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, there is a linear map $\mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$\mathbf{x} := (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \mapsto \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} x_i w_i.$$

Let $l_\mathbf{w}$ be the restriction of this map to $\Gamma_+(h;\mathbf{z})$, let $d_\mathbf{w}$ be the minimal value of $l_\mathbf{w}$, and let $\Delta_\mathbf{w}$ be the face of $\Gamma_+(h;\mathbf{z})$ defined by the locus where $l_\mathbf{w}$ takes this minimal value. It is easy to see that

$$d_\mathbf{w} := \inf_{c_\alpha \neq 0} \deg_\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{z}^\alpha),$$

where $\deg_\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{z}^\alpha)$ is the $\mathbf{w}$-degree of the monomial $\mathbf{z}^\alpha$, which is defined by

$$\deg_\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{z}^\alpha) := \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} \alpha_i w_i = l_\mathbf{w}(\alpha).$$

Note that $\Delta_\mathbf{w} = \{\mathbf{x} \in \Gamma_+(h;\mathbf{z})\ ;\ l_\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{x}) = d_\mathbf{w}\}$, and if $w_i > 0$ for each $1 \leq i \leq n$, then $\Delta_\mathbf{w}$ is a (compact) face of the Newton boundary $\Gamma(h;\mathbf{z})$.

Definition 2.1. The *non-compact Newton boundary* of h at $\mathbf{0}$ with respect to $\mathbf{z}$ (denoted by $\Gamma_{nc}(h;\mathbf{z})$) is obtained from the usual Newton boundary $\Gamma(h;\mathbf{z})$ by adding the "essential" non-compact faces. Here, a non-compact face Δ is said to be *essential* if there are weights $\mathbf{w} := (w_1, \ldots, w_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ such that the following two conditions hold:

(i) $\Delta = \Delta_\mathbf{w}$ (i.e., Δ is the face defined by the locus where $l_\mathbf{w}$ takes its minimal value) and $h_{|\mathbb{C}^{I_\mathbf{w}}} = 0$, where $I_\mathbf{w} := \big\{i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}\ ;\ w_i = 0\big\}$;
(ii) for any $i \in I_\mathbf{w}$ and any point $\alpha \in \Delta$, the half-line $\alpha + \mathbb{R}_+ \mathbf{e}_i$ is contained in Δ, where $\mathbf{e}_i$ is the unit vector in the direction of the x_i-axis.

The set $I_\mathbf{w}$ does not depend on the choice of the weights $\mathbf{w}$. It is called the *non-compact direction* of Δ and is denoted by I_Δ.



FIGURE 1. Essential and non-essential non-compact faces

Example 2.2 (cf. [11])**.** If $h(z_1,z_2,z_3)=z_1^3+z_2^3+z_2z_3^2$, then the non-compact face $\Delta:=\overline{AC}+\mathbb{R}_+\mathbf{e}_3$ is essential, where $\overline{AC}$ is the edge with endpoints $A=(3,0,0)$ and $C=(0,1,2)$. Indeed, we can take $\mathbf{w}=(1,3,0)$. Then $\Delta=\Delta_{\mathbf{w}}$, $I_\Delta=\{3\}$ and $h(0,0,z_3)=0$ for any z_3. On the other hand, the non-compact face containing the edge $\overline{AB}$ (respectively, the edge $\overline{BC}$), where $B=(0,3,0)$, is not essential. Indeed, h does not identically vanish neither on $\mathbb{C}^{\{1,2\}}$ nor on $\mathbb{C}^{\{2,3\}}$. See Figure 1.

Remark 2.3. Note that an essential non-compact face is not necessarily a maximal face of the Newton polygon. Indeed, in the above example, the 1-dimensional non-compact face $\Xi:=C+\mathbb{R}_+\mathbf{e}_3$ is also essential. Indeed, we can take $\mathbf{w}'=(1,2,0)$. Then $\Xi=\Delta_{\mathbf{w}'}$, $I_\Xi=\{3\}$ and $h(0,0,z_3)=0$ for any z_3.

Definition 2.4. The function h is said to be *non-degenerate* if for any (compact) face $\Delta\subseteq\Gamma(h;\mathbf{z})$, the face function

$$h_\Delta(\mathbf{z}):=\sum_{\alpha\in\Delta}c_\alpha\mathbf{z}^\alpha$$

has no critical point on $(\mathbb{C}^*)^n$.

Let $\mathscr{I}_{nv}(h)$ (respectively, $\mathscr{I}_v(h)$) be the set of all subsets $I\subseteq\{1,\dots,n\}$ such that $h_{|\mathbb{C}^I}\neq 0$ (respectively, $h_{|\mathbb{C}^I}=0$). For any $I\in\mathscr{I}_{nv}(h)$ (respectively, any $I\in\mathscr{I}_v(h)$), the subspace $\mathbb{C}^I$ is called a *non-vanishing* (respectively, a *vanishing*) coordinates subspace. For any $u_{i_1},\dots,u_{i_m}\in\mathbb{C}^*$ ($m\leq n$), we set

$$\mathbb{C}^{*\{1,\dots,n\}}_{u_{i_1},\dots,u_{i_m}}:=\big\{(z_1,\dots,z_n)\in(\mathbb{C}^*)^n;\,z_{i_j}=u_{i_j}\text{ for }1\leq j\leq m\big\}.$$

Definition 2.5. Let $\Delta\subseteq\Gamma_{nc}(h;\mathbf{z})$ be an essential non-compact face, and let $\mathbf{w}=(w_1,\dots,w_n)$ be a system of weights satisfying the conditions (i) and (ii) of Definition 2.1. Suppose that $I_\Delta:=I_{\mathbf{w}}=\{i_1,\dots,i_m\}$ (i.e., $w_i=0$ if and only if $i\in\{i_1,\dots,i_m\}$). We say that the face function

$$h_\Delta(\mathbf{z}):=\sum_{\alpha\in\Delta}c_\alpha\mathbf{z}^\alpha$$

is *locally tame* if there exists a positive number $r(h_\Delta)>0$ such that for any non-zero complex numbers $u_{i_1},\dots,u_{i_m}\in\mathbb{C}^*$ with

$$|u_{i_1}|^2+\cdots+|u_{i_m}|^2<r(h_\Delta)^2,$$

h_Δ has no critical point in $\mathbb{C}^{*\{1,\dots,n\}}_{u_{i_1},\dots,u_{i_m}}$ as a function of the $n-m$ variables $z_{i_{m+1}},\dots,z_{i_n}$. (Here, $\{i_{m+1},\dots,i_n\}=\{1,\dots,n\}\setminus\{i_1,\dots,i_m\}$.) We say that h is *locally tame along a vanishing coordinates subspace* $\mathbb{C}^I$ if for any essential non-compact face $\Delta\subseteq\Gamma_{nc}(h;\mathbf{z})$ with $I_\Delta=I$, the face function h_Δ is locally tame. Finally, we say that h is *locally tame along the vanishing coordinates subspaces* if it is locally tame along $\mathbb{C}^I$ for any $I\in\mathscr{I}_v(h)$.

Notation 2.6. For any $I\in\mathscr{I}_v(h)$, let

$$r_I(h):=\inf_{I_\Delta=I} r(h_\Delta).$$

Also, let

$$r_{nc}(h):=\inf_{I\in\mathscr{I}_v(h)} r_I(h).$$

Example 2.7. If $h(z_1,z_2)=z_1^2z_2^3+z_1^3z_2^2+2z_1^2z_2^4$, then $\Gamma_{nc}(h;\mathbf{z})$ has two essential non-compact faces $\Delta_1:=A+\mathbb{R}_+\mathbf{e}_2$ and $\Delta_2:=B+\mathbb{R}_+\mathbf{e}_1$, where $A=(2,3)$ and $B=(3,2)$. Here, $I_{\Delta_1}=\{2\}$ and $I_{\Delta_2}=\{1\}$. For any $u_2\in\mathbb{C}^*$ with $|u_2|<1/2$, the function

$$z_1\mapsto h_{\Delta_1}(z_1,u_2)=z_1^2u_2^3+2z_1^2u_2^4$$

of the variable z_1 has no critical point on $\mathbb{C}^{*\{1,2\}}_{u_2}$. Thus the face function h_{Δ_1} is locally tame (we can take $r(h_{\Delta_1})=1/2$). Similarly, for any $u_1\in\mathbb{C}^*$, the function

$$z_2\mapsto h_{\Delta_2}(u_1,z_2)=u_1^3z_2^2$$

of the variable z_2 has no critical point on $\mathbb{C}^{*\{1,2\}}_{u_1}$, and hence the face function h_{Δ_2} is locally tame. Altogether, h is locally tame along the vanishing coordinates subspaces.

Example 2.8. If $h(z_1,z_2,z_3)=z_1^2z_3^2-z_2^3z_3^2+z_3^3$, then $\Delta:=\overline{AB}+\mathbb{R}_+\mathbf{e}_1+\mathbb{R}_+\mathbf{e}_2$ is an essential non-compact face, where $\overline{AB}$ is the edge with endpoints $A=(2,0,2)$ and $B=(0,3,2)$. Here, $I_\Delta=\{1,2\}$. For any positive number $r>0$, there exist $u_1,u_2\in\mathbb{C}^*$ such that $|u_1|^2+|u_2|^2<r^2$ but the function

$$z_3\mapsto h_\Delta(u_1,u_2,z_3)=u_1^2z_3^2-u_2^3z_3^2$$

of the variable z_3 has critical points on $\mathbb{C}^{*\{1,2,3\}}_{u_1,u_2}$. Indeed, the derivative of $z_3\mapsto h_\Delta(u_1,u_2,z_3)$ is zero along the curve $u_1^2-u_2^3=0$. It follows that h_Δ (and therefore h) is not locally tame.

3. Admissible families and Whitney equisingularity

Let $(t,\mathbf{z}):=(t,z_1,\dots,z_n)$ be coordinates for $\mathbb{C}\times\mathbb{C}^n$, let U be an open neighbourhood of $\mathbf{0}\in\mathbb{C}^n$, let D be an open disc centered at $0\in\mathbb{C}$, and let

$$f\colon (D\times U,D\times\{\mathbf{0}\})\to(\mathbb{C},0),\ (t,\mathbf{z})\mapsto f(t,\mathbf{z}),$$

be a polynomial function. (This notation implies that $f(D\times\{\mathbf{0}\})=\{0\}$.) As above, we write $f_t(\mathbf{z}):=f(t,\mathbf{z})$ and we denote by $V(f_t)$ the hypersurface in $U\subseteq\mathbb{C}^n$ defined by f_t. In §3.2 of the present section, we introduce a condition (admissibility condition) that will guarantee Whitney equisingularity for families of non-isolated singularities. Roughly, a family $\{f_t\}$ is admissible if for all t small enough, the non-compact Newton boundary $\Gamma_{nc}(f_t;\mathbf{z})$ is independent of t, the polynomial function f_t is non-degenerate, and the radius $r_{nc}(f_t)$ which appear in Definition 2.5 and

Notation 2.6 is greater than or equal to a fixed positive number $\rho > 0$. But before to go into further details, we first need to show that if the Newton boundary $\Gamma(f_t;\mathbf{z})$ is independent of t and f_t is non-degenerate for all small t, then, in a neighbourhood of the origin $\mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{C}^n$, the hypersurface $V(f_t)$ is smooth along $\mathbb{C}^{*I}$ for any $I \in \mathscr{I}_{nv}(f_t)$ and any t small enough (cf. §3.1).

3.1. **Smoothness along the non-vanishing coordinates subspaces.** The following proposition is a uniform version of [9, Chapter III, Lemma (2.2)] and [10, Theorem 19].

Proposition 3.1. *Suppose that for all t sufficiently small, the following two conditions are satisfied:*

(1) *the Newton boundary $\Gamma(f_t;\mathbf{z})$ of f_t at $\mathbf{0}$ with respect to the coordinates $\mathbf{z}$ is independent of t (in particular, $\mathscr{I}_{nv}(f_t)$ is independent of t);*
(2) *the polynomial function f_t is non-degenerate.*

Then there exists a positive number $R > 0$ such that for any $I \in \mathscr{I}_{nv}(f_0)$ and any t sufficiently small, the set $V(f_t) \cap \mathbb{C}^{*I} \cap B_R$ is non-singular and intersects transversely with S_r for any $r < R$, where B_R (respectively, S_r) is the open ball (respectively, the sphere) with centre the origin $\mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ and radius R (respectively, r).

Proof. As there are only finitely many subsets $I \in \mathscr{I}_{nv}(f_0)$, it suffices to show that for a fixed $I \in \mathscr{I}_{nv}(f_0)$, there is $R > 0$ such that for any t small enough, $V(f_t) \cap \mathbb{C}^{*I} \cap B_R$ is non-singular and intersects transversely with the sphere S_r for any $r \leq R$. To simplify, we may assume that $I = \{1,\dots,m\}$.

We start with the "smoothness" assertion. We argue by contradiction. Suppose that there exists a sequence $\{(t_N,\mathbf{z}_N)\}$ of points in $V(f) \cap (D \times \mathbb{C}^{*I})$ converging to $(0,\mathbf{0})$ and such that $\mathbf{z}_N$ is a critical point of the restriction of f_{t_N} to $\mathbb{C}^I$. Then $(0,\mathbf{0})$ is in the closure of the set

$$W := \left\{ (t,\mathbf{z}) \in D \times \mathbb{C}^{*I};\ f_{t|\mathbb{C}^I}(\mathbf{z}) = 0 \text{ and } \frac{\partial (f_{t|\mathbb{C}^I})}{\partial z_i}(\mathbf{z}) = 0 \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq m \right\}.$$

Therefore, by the curve selection lemma [5], there is a real analytic curve

$$(t(s),\mathbf{z}(s)) = (t(s),z_1(s),\dots,z_m(s),0,\dots,0)$$

such that $(t(0),\mathbf{z}(0)) = (0,\mathbf{0})$ and $(t(s),\mathbf{z}(s)) \in W$ for any $s \neq 0$. For $1 \leq i \leq m$, consider the Taylor expansions

$$t(s) = t_0 s^{v} + \cdots,$$
$$z_i(s) = a_i s^{w_i} + \cdots,$$

where $t_0, a_i \neq 0$ and $v, w_i > 0$. Here, the dots stand for the higher order terms. Let $\mathbf{a} := (a_1,\dots,a_m,0,\dots,0) \in \mathbb{C}^{*I}$ and $\mathbf{w} := (w_1,\dots,w_m,0,\dots,0) \in \mathbb{N}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, and let Δ be the face of $\Gamma\big(f_{t(s)|\mathbb{C}^I};\mathbf{z}\big) = \Gamma\big(f_{0|\mathbb{C}^I};\mathbf{z}\big)$ defined by the locus where the map

$$\mathbf{x} := (x_1,\dots,x_m,0,\dots,0) \in \Gamma(f_{t(s)|\mathbb{C}^I};\mathbf{z}) \mapsto \sum_{1\leq i\leq m} x_i w_i$$

takes its minimal value d. For any $1 \leq i \leq m$ and any $s \neq 0$,

$$0 = \frac{\partial \big(f_{t(s)|\mathbb{C}^I}\big)}{\partial z_i}(\mathbf{z}(s)) = \frac{\partial \big(f_{t(s)|\mathbb{C}^I}\big)_\Delta}{\partial z_i}(\mathbf{a})\, s^{d-w_i} + \cdots,$$

where $\left(f_{t(s)|\mathbb{C}^I}\right)_\Delta$ is the face function associated with $f_{t(s)|\mathbb{C}^I}$ and Δ. It follows that

$$\frac{\partial\left(f_{0|\mathbb{C}^I}\right)_\Delta}{\partial z_i}(\mathbf{a}) = 0$$

for any $1 \le i \le m$. Therefore, $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{C}^{*I}$ is a critical point of $\left(f_{0|\mathbb{C}^I}\right)_\Delta \colon \mathbb{C}^I \to \mathbb{C}$. In particular, this implies that $f_{0|\mathbb{C}^I}$ is *not* non-degenerate as a function of the variables $z_1, \ldots, z_m$. This contradicts Proposition 7 of [10] which says that if a polynomial function f_0 is non-degenerate and if $f_{0|\mathbb{C}^I} \neq 0$, then $f_{0|\mathbb{C}^I}$ must be non-degenerate as well.

To prove the "transversality" assertion, we also argue by contradiction. Suppose that there exists a sequence $\{(t_N, \mathbf{z}_N)\}$ of points in $V(f) \cap (D \times \mathbb{C}^{*I})$ converging to $(0, \mathbf{0})$ and such that $V(f_{t_N}) \cap \mathbb{C}^{*I}$ does not intersect the sphere $S_{\|z_N\|}$ transversely at $\mathbf{z}_N$. Then $(0, \mathbf{0})$ is in the closure of the set consisting of points $(t, \mathbf{z}) \in D \times \mathbb{C}^{*I}$ such that

$$f_{t|\mathbb{C}^I}(\mathbf{z}) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \operatorname{grad} f_{t|\mathbb{C}^I}(\mathbf{z}) = \lambda \mathbf{z} \text{ for } \lambda \in \mathbb{C}^*.$$

Here, $\operatorname{grad} f_{t|\mathbb{C}^I}(\mathbf{z})$ is the gradient vector of $f_{t|\mathbb{C}^I}$ at $\mathbf{z}$, that is,

$$\operatorname{grad} f_{t|\mathbb{C}^I}(\mathbf{z}) := \left(\overline{\frac{\partial f_{t|\mathbb{C}^I}}{\partial z_1}(\mathbf{z})}, \ldots, \overline{\frac{\partial f_{t|\mathbb{C}^I}}{\partial z_m}(\mathbf{z})}, 0, \ldots, 0\right),$$

where the bar stands for the complex conjugation. Thus, by the curve selection lemma, we can find a real analytic curve

$$(t(s), \mathbf{z}(s)) = (t(s), z_1(s), \ldots, z_m(s), 0, \ldots, 0)$$

and a Laurent series $\lambda(s)$ such that:

(i) $(t(0), \mathbf{z}(0)) = (0, \mathbf{0})$;
(ii) $(t(s), \mathbf{z}(s)) \in D \times \mathbb{C}^{*I}$ for $s \neq 0$;
(iii) $f_{t(s)}(\mathbf{z}(s)) = 0$;
(iv) $\operatorname{grad} f_{t(s)|\mathbb{C}^I}(\mathbf{z}(s)) = \lambda(s)\mathbf{z}(s)$.

Consider the Taylor expansions

$$t(s) = t_0 s^\nu + \cdots,$$
$$z_i(s) = a_i s^{w_i} + \cdots \ (1 \le i \le m),$$

where $t_0, a_i \neq 0$ and $\nu, w_i > 0$, and the Laurent expansion

$$\lambda(s) = \lambda_0 s^\omega + \cdots,$$

where $\lambda_0 \neq 0$. Then define $\mathbf{a}$, $\mathbf{w}$, d and Δ as above. By reordering, we may assume that $w_1 = \cdots = w_k < w_j$ $(k < j \le m)$. Then, by (iv), we have $d - w_1 = \omega + w_1$ and

$$\overline{\frac{\partial\left(f_{0|\mathbb{C}^I}\right)_\Delta}{\partial z_i}(\mathbf{a})} = \begin{cases} \lambda_0 a_i & \text{for} \quad 1 \le i \le k, \\ 0 & \text{for} \quad k < i \le m. \end{cases} \tag{3.1}$$

Since the polynomial $\left(f_{0|\mathbb{C}^I}\right)_\Delta$ is weighted homogeneous with respect to the weights $\mathbf{w}$ and has weighted degree d, it follows from the Euler identity that

$$d \cdot \left(f_{0|\mathbb{C}^I}\right)_\Delta(\mathbf{a}) = \sum_{1 \le i \le m} w_i a_i \frac{\partial\left(f_{0|\mathbb{C}^I}\right)_\Delta}{\partial z_i}(\mathbf{a}). \tag{3.2}$$

As $f(t(s),\mathbf{z}(s))=0$ for any s, we have $\left(f_{0|\mathbb{C}^I}\right)_\Delta(\mathbf{a})=0$. Therefore, by combining (3.1) and (3.2), we get a contradiction:

$$0=\sum_{1\leq i\leq m} w_i a_i \frac{\partial\left(f_{0|\mathbb{C}^I}\right)_\Delta}{\partial z_i}(\mathbf{a})=\bar{\lambda}_0\sum_{1\leq i\leq k} w_i|a_i|^2\neq 0.$$

This completes the proof of Proposition 3.1. □

Remark 3.2. Under the same assumption as in Proposition 3.1, the second author showed in [7] that there also exists a positive number $R'>0$ such that for any $0<R''\leq R'$, the exists $\delta(R'')>0$ such that for any $\eta\neq 0$ with $|\eta|\leq\delta(R'')$ and any r with $R''\leq r\leq R'$, the set $f_t^{-1}(\eta)\cap B_{R'}$ is non-singular and transversely intersects the sphere S_r for all t small enough.

3.2. **Admissible families and the main theorem.** Throughout this subsection, we assume that for all t sufficiently small, the following two conditions hold:

(I) the non-compact Newton boundary $\Gamma_{nc}(f_t;\mathbf{z})$ of f_t at $\mathbf{0}$ with respect to $\mathbf{z}$ is independent of t (in particular, $\mathscr{I}_{nv}(f_t)$ and $\mathscr{I}_v(f_t)$ are independent of t);

(II) the polynomial function f_t is non-degenerate and locally tame along the vanishing coordinates subspaces (i.e., locally tame along $\mathbb{C}^I$ for any $I\in\mathscr{I}_v(f_t)=\mathscr{I}_v(f_0)$); we denote by $r_{nc}(f_t)$ the corresponding positive number defined in Definition 2.5 and Notation 2.6.

Remark 3.3. $\Gamma_{nc}(f_t;\mathbf{z})=\Gamma_{nc}(f_0;\mathbf{z})\Leftrightarrow\Gamma(f_t;\mathbf{z})=\Gamma(f_0;\mathbf{z})\Leftrightarrow\Gamma_+(f_t;\mathbf{z})=\Gamma_+(f_0;\mathbf{z})$.

By Proposition 3.1, we know that there exists a positive number $R>0$ such that for any $I\in\mathscr{I}_{nv}(f_t)=\mathscr{I}_{nv}(f_0)$ and any t small enough, $V(f_t)\cap\mathbb{C}^{*I}\cap B_R$ is non-singular. It follows immediately that in a sufficiently small open neighbourhood $\mathscr{U}\subseteq D\times U$ of the origin of $\mathbb{C}\times\mathbb{C}^n$, the set $V(f)\cap(\mathbb{C}\times\mathbb{C}^{*I})$ is non-singular for any $I\in\mathscr{I}_{nv}(f_t)$. Therefore, in such a neighbourhood, we can stratify $\mathbb{C}\times\mathbb{C}^n$ in such a way that the hypersurface $V(f):=f^{-1}(0)$ is a union of strata. More precisely, we consider the following three types of strata:

- $A_I:=\mathscr{U}\cap(V(f)\cap(\mathbb{C}\times\mathbb{C}^{*I}))$ for $I\in\mathscr{I}_{nv}(f_0)$;
- $B_I:=\mathscr{U}\cap((\mathbb{C}\times\mathbb{C}^{*I})\setminus(V(f)\cap(\mathbb{C}\times\mathbb{C}^{*I})))$ for $I\in\mathscr{I}_{nv}(f_0)$;
- $C_I:=\mathscr{U}\cap(\mathbb{C}\times\mathbb{C}^{*I})$ for $I\in\mathscr{I}_v(f_0)$.

The (finite) collection

$$\mathscr{S}:=\{A_I,B_I\,;\,I\in\mathscr{I}_{nv}(f_0)\}\cup\{C_I\,;\,I\in\mathscr{I}_v(f_0)\}$$

is a stratification (i.e., a partition into complex analytic submanifolds) of the set $\mathscr{U}\cap(\mathbb{C}\times\mathbb{C}^n)$ for which $\mathscr{U}\cap V(f)$ is a union of strata. Note that for $I=\emptyset$, which is an element of $\mathscr{I}_v(f_0)$, the stratum $C_\emptyset:=\mathscr{U}\cap(\mathbb{C}\times\mathbb{C}^{*\emptyset})$ of $\mathscr{S}$ is nothing but the t-axis $\mathscr{U}\cap(\mathbb{C}\times\{\mathbf{0}\})$.

Remark 3.4. A similar stratification but for a *single* polynomial function $h(\mathbf{z})$ (not for a family) is already considered in [11] where the second author shows that if h is non-degenerate and locally tame along the vanishing coordinates subspaces, then it satisfies Thom's a_h condition with respect to this stratification.

Definition 3.5. We say that the family $\{f_t\}$ is *admissible* (at $t=0$) if it satisfies the conditions (I) and (II) above and if, furthermore, there exists a positive number $\rho>0$ such that for any sufficiently small t,

$$\inf\{R,r_{nc}(f_t)\}\geq\rho,$$

where R is given by Proposition 3.1.

In particular, if the family $\{f_t\}$ is admissible, then it is *uniformly* locally tame along the vanishing coordinates subspaces—that is, f_t is locally tame along $\mathbb{C}^I$ for any $I \in \mathscr{I}_v(f_0)$ and $r_{nc}(f_t) \geq \rho$ for all small t.

Here is our main result.

Theorem 3.6. *If the family of polynomial functions $\{f_t\}$ is admissible, then the canonical stratification $\mathscr{S}$ of $\mathscr{U} \cap (\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}^n)$ described above is a Whitney stratification, and hence, the corresponding family of hypersurfaces $\{V(f_t)\}$ is Whitney equisingular.*

We recall that a stratification of a subset of $\mathbb{C}^N$ is a *Whitney stratification* if the closure $\overline{S}$ of each stratum S and the complement $\overline{S} \setminus S$ are both analytic sets, and if for any pair of strata (S_2, S_1) and any point $\mathbf{p} \in S_1 \cap \overline{S_2}$, the stratum S_2 is Whitney (b)-regular over the stratum S_1 at the point $\mathbf{p}$. The latter condition means that for any sequences of points $\{\mathbf{p}_k\}$ in S_1, $\{\mathbf{q}_k\}$ in S_2 and $\{a_k\}$ in $\mathbb{C}$ satisfying:

(i) $\mathbf{p}_k \to \mathbf{p}$ and $\mathbf{q}_k \to \mathbf{p}$;
(ii) $T_{\mathbf{q}_k} S_2 \to T$;
(iii) $a_k(\mathbf{p}_k - \mathbf{q}_k) \to v$;

we have $v \in T$. (As usual, $T_{\mathbf{q}_k} S_2$ is the tangent space to S_2 at $\mathbf{q}_k$.) For details, we refer the reader to [2].

Remark 3.7. Observe that if M is a smooth manifold and $N \subseteq M$ is a closed smooth submanifold, then $M \setminus N$ is Whitney (b)-regular over N at any point.

Theorem 3.6 will be proved in Section 4. The proof will show that for *isolated* singularities, if $\Gamma(f_t; \mathbf{z})$ is independent of t and f_t is non-degenerate for all small t, then the conclusions of Theorem 3.6 still holds true without assuming the uniform local tameness (cf. Remark 4.2). In other words, Theorem 3.6 includes Assertion 1.1 as a special case.

Remark 3.8. In [8, §8], another Whitney stratification of $\mathscr{U} \cap (\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}^n)$, with the t-axis as a stratum and such that $\mathscr{U} \cap V(f)$ is a union of strata, is constructed under a different assumption (so-called "simultaneous IND-condition"). However this stratification is different from our. Especially, it has a larger number of strata.

Combined with the Thom-Mather first isotopy theorem (cf. [2, 4, 12]), Theorem 3.6 implies the following result.

Corollary 3.9. *If the family of polynomial functions $\{f_t\}$ is admissible, then the corresponding family of hypersurfaces $\{V(f_t)\}$ is topologically equisingular.*

Remark 3.10. Topological equisingularity is also proved in [8, Theorem (8.2)] under the simultaneous IND-condition.

Proof of Corollary 3.9. By Theorem 3.6, $(\mathscr{U} \cap (\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}^n), \mathscr{S})$ is a Whitney stratified set. Hence, by the Thom-Mather first isotopy theorem, it is topologically locally trivial (see, e.g., Theorem (5.2) and Corollary (5.5) of [2]). As the stratum $C_\emptyset$ is nothing but the t-axis, Corollary 3.9 follows. □

4. Proof of Theorem 3.6

First of all, observe that if $I \subseteq J$, then $\mathbb{C}^{*I}$ is contained in the closure $\overline{\mathbb{C}^{*J}}$ of $\mathbb{C}^{*J}$. Moreover, if $I \subseteq J$ and $J \in \mathscr{I}_v(f_0)$, then $I \in \mathscr{I}_v(f_0)$ too. Therefore, to prove the theorem, it suffices to check that the Whitney (b)-regularity condition holds for all the pairs of strata satisfying one of the following three conditions:

(1) $C_I \cap \overline{C_J} \neq \emptyset$ with $I \subseteq J$ and $I, J \in \mathscr{I}_v(f_0)$;
(2) $C_I \cap \overline{A_J} \neq \emptyset$ or $C_I \cap \overline{B_J} \neq \emptyset$ with $I \subseteq J$ and $I \in \mathscr{I}_v(f_0)$, $J \in \mathscr{I}_{nv}(f_0)$;
(3) $A_I \cap \overline{A_J} \neq \emptyset$, $A_I \cap \overline{B_J} \neq \emptyset$ or $B_I \cap \overline{B_J} \neq \emptyset$ with $I \subseteq J$ and $I, J \in \mathscr{I}_{nv}(f_0)$.

Except for the case of a pair of strata of the form (A_J, C_I), the Whitney (b)-regularity condition immediately follows from Remark 3.7. Thus, to prove our result, it suffices to show that for any $J \in \mathscr{I}_{nv}(f_0)$ and any $I \in \mathscr{I}_v(f_0)$, with $I \subseteq J$, $A_J := \mathscr{U} \cap (V(f) \cap (\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}^{*J}))$ is Whitney (b)-regular over $C_I := \mathscr{U} \cap (\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}^{*I})$ at any point $(\tau, \mathbf{q}) = (\tau, q_1, \ldots, q_n) \in C_I \cap \overline{A_J}$ sufficiently close to the origin of $\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}^n$. To simplify, without loss of generality, we may assume that $J = \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and $I = \{1, \ldots, m\}$ with $1 \leq m \leq n-1$. (For $I = \emptyset$, see Remark 4.1.) In particular, $q_i \neq 0$ if and only if $1 \leq i \leq m$. By the curve selection lemma [5], it is enough to show that the Whitney (b)-regularity condition holds along arbitrary real analytic paths

$$\gamma(s) := (t(s), \mathbf{z}(s)) := (t(s), z_1(s), \ldots, z_n(s))$$
$$\tilde{\gamma}(s) := (\tilde{t}(s), \tilde{\mathbf{z}}(s)) := (\tilde{t}(s), \tilde{z}_1(s), \ldots, \tilde{z}_n(s))$$

such that $\gamma(0) = \tilde{\gamma}(0) = (\tau, \mathbf{q})$, and $\tilde{\gamma}(s) \in C_I$ and $\gamma(s) \in A_J$ for $s \neq 0$. Consider the Taylor expansions (where, as above, the dots stand for the higher order terms):

$$t(s) = \tau + b_0 s + \cdots, \quad z_i(s) = a_i s^{w_i} + b_i s^{w_i+1} + \cdots,$$
$$\tilde{t}(s) = \tau + \tilde{b}_0 s + \cdots, \quad \tilde{z}_i(s) = q_i + \tilde{b}_i s + \cdots,$$

where $w_i = 0$ and $a_i = q_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$ while $w_i > 0$ and $a_i \neq 0$ for $i > m$. Note that, for any s, we have $\tilde{z}_i(s) = 0$ if $i > m$. Let

$$\ell(s) := \overrightarrow{\tilde{\gamma}(s)\gamma(s)} = (\ell_0(s), \ell_1(s), \ldots, \ell_n(s))$$

where

$$\ell_i(s) := \begin{cases} (b_0 - \tilde{b}_0)s + \cdots & \text{for } i = 0, \\ (b_i - \tilde{b}_i)s + \cdots & \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq m, \\ a_i s^{w_i} + \cdots & \text{for } m+1 \leq i \leq n. \end{cases}$$

By reordering, we may suppose that

$$\begin{aligned} w_{m+1} = \cdots = w_{m+m_1} < w_{m+m_1+1} = \cdots = w_{m+m_1+m_2} < \cdots \\ \cdots < w_{m+m_1+\cdots+m_{k-1}+1} = \cdots = w_{m+m_1+\cdots+m_k} = w_n, \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

for some non-negative integers $m_1, \ldots, m_k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $m + m_1 + \cdots + m_k = n$. To show that the pair of strata (A_J, C_I) satisfies the Whitney (b)-regularity condition at the point $(\tau, \mathbf{q})$, we have to prove that

$$\lim_{s \to 0} \frac{\langle \ell(s), \operatorname{grad} f(\gamma(s)) \rangle}{\|\ell(s)\| \cdot \|\operatorname{grad} f(\gamma(s))\|} = 0, \tag{4.2}$$

where $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ is the standard Hermitian inner product on $\mathbb{C}\times\mathbb{C}^n$ and $\operatorname{grad} f(\gamma(s))$ is the gradient vector of f at $\gamma(s)$, that is,

$$\operatorname{grad} f(\gamma(s)) := \left(\overline{\frac{\partial f}{\partial t}(\gamma(s))}, \overline{\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_1}(\gamma(s))}, \ldots, \overline{\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_n}(\gamma(s))}\right),$$

where the bar stands for the complex conjugation. Let

$$\operatorname{ord}\ell(s) := \inf_{0\le i\le n} \operatorname{ord}\ell_i(s)$$

where $\operatorname{ord}\ell_i(s)$ is the order (in s) of the i-th component $\ell_i(s)$ of $\ell(s)$. Clearly, $\operatorname{ord}\ell(s) \le w_{m+1}$. Note that if $\operatorname{ord}\ell(s) < w_{m+1}$, then

$$\lim_{s\to 0} \frac{\ell(s)}{|s|^{\operatorname{ord}\ell(s)}} = (*, \underbrace{*,\ldots,*}_{m \text{ terms}}, \underbrace{0,\ldots,0}_{n-m \text{ zeros}}), \tag{4.3}$$

where each term marked with a star "$*$" represents a complex number which may be zero or not. On the other hand, if $\operatorname{ord}\ell(s) = w_{m+1}$, then

$$\lim_{s\to 0} \frac{\ell(s)}{|s|^{\operatorname{ord}\ell(s)}} = (*, \underbrace{*,\ldots,*}_{m \text{ terms}}, a_{m+1},\ldots,a_{m+m_1}, \underbrace{0,\ldots,0}_{n-m-m_1 \text{ zeros}}). \tag{4.4}$$

Let $\mathbf{w} := (w_1,\ldots,w_n) = (0,\ldots,0,w_{m+1},\ldots,w_n)$, and let $l_{\mathbf{w}}\colon \Gamma \to \mathbb{R}$ be the restriction of the linear map

$$(x_1,\ldots,x_n)\in\mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \sum_{1\le i\le n} x_i w_i \in \mathbb{R},$$

where Γ is the non-compact Newton boundary $\Gamma_{nc}(f_t;\mathbf{z})$, which is independent of t. Denote by $d_{\mathbf{w}}$ the minimal value of $l_{\mathbf{w}}$, and write $\Delta_{\mathbf{w}}$ for the face of Γ defined by the locus where $l_{\mathbf{w}}$ takes this minimal value. Clearly, $\Delta_{\mathbf{w}}$ is an essential non-compact face, and $I_{\Delta_{\mathbf{w}}} = I$. Finally, let $\mathbf{a} := (a_1,\ldots,a_n)$. As Γ does not depend on t,

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_i}(\gamma(s)) = \frac{\partial (f_\tau)_{\Delta_{\mathbf{w}}}}{\partial z_i}(\mathbf{a})\, s^{d_{\mathbf{w}}-w_i} + \cdots \tag{4.5}$$

for any $1\le i\le n$, while

$$\lim_{s\to 0}\left(\frac{1}{|s|^{d_{\mathbf{w}}-1}}\cdot\frac{\partial f}{\partial t}(\gamma(s))\right) = 0. \tag{4.6}$$

(As usual, $(f_\tau)_{\Delta_{\mathbf{w}}}$ is the face function associated with f_τ and $\Delta_{\mathbf{w}}$.) Also, note that, by (4.1),

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathbf{w}} - w_{m+1} = \cdots = d_{\mathbf{w}} - w_{m+m_1} > d_{\mathbf{w}} - w_{m+m_1+1} = \cdots \\ \cdots = d_{\mathbf{w}} - w_{m+m_1+m_2} > \cdots\ d_{\mathbf{w}} - w_n. \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

Let $o(s) := \operatorname{ord}(\overline{\operatorname{grad} f(\gamma(s))})$, that is,

$$o(s) := \inf\left\{\operatorname{ord}\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial t}(\gamma(s))\right), \inf_{1\le i\le n}\operatorname{ord}\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_i}(\gamma(s))\right)\right\}.$$

By the uniform local tameness (i.e., the condition $r_{nc}(f_t)\ge\rho$ for all small t), if $(\tau,\mathbf{q})$ is close enough to $(0,\mathbf{0})\in\mathbb{C}\times\mathbb{C}^n$, then there exists an integer $i_0\in\{m+1,\ldots,n\}$ such that

$$\frac{\partial (f_\tau)_{\Delta_{\mathbf{w}}}}{\partial z_{i_0}}(\mathbf{a}) \neq 0. \tag{4.8}$$

Combined with (4.5), the relation (4.8) shows that

$$o(s) \leq d_{\mathbf{w}} - w_{i_0} \overset{(4.7)}{\leq} d_{\mathbf{w}} - w_{m+1} \leq d_{\mathbf{w}} - 1.$$

Then, by (4.6),

$$\lim_{s\to 0}\left(\frac{1}{|s|^{o(s)}}\cdot\frac{\partial f}{\partial t}(\gamma(s))\right) = 0,$$

and since $w_i = 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$,

(4.9)

$$\lim_{s\to 0}\frac{\operatorname{grad} f(\gamma(s))}{|s|^{o(s)}} = \begin{cases} (0, \underbrace{0,\dots,0}_{m+m_1 \text{ zeros}}, \underbrace{*,\dots,*}_{n-m-m_1 \text{ terms}}) & \text{if} \quad o(s) < d_{\mathbf{w}} - w_{m+1}, \\ \left(0, \underbrace{0,\dots,0}_{m \text{ zeros}}, \overline{\frac{\partial (f_\tau)_{\Delta_{\mathbf{w}}}}{\partial z_{m+1}}(\mathbf{a})}, \dots, \overline{\frac{\partial (f_\tau)_{\Delta_{\mathbf{w}}}}{\partial z_{m+m_1}}(\mathbf{a})}, \underbrace{*,\dots,*}_{n-m-m_1 \text{ terms}}\right) & \\ \qquad\qquad \text{if} \quad o(s) = d_{\mathbf{w}} - w_{m+1}. & \end{cases}$$

Since $\|\ell(s)\| \sim c_1|s|^{\operatorname{ord}\ell(s)}$ and $\|\operatorname{grad} f(\gamma(s))\| \sim c_2|s|^{o(s)}$ as $s \to 0$ (c_1, c_2 constants), it follows immediately from (4.3), (4.4) and (4.9) that the relation (4.2) is satisfied if $o(s) < d_{\mathbf{w}} - w_{m+1}$ or if $o(s) = d_{\mathbf{w}} - w_{m+1}$ and $\operatorname{ord}\ell(s) < w_{m+1}$. In order to show that (4.2) also holds when $o(s) = d_{\mathbf{w}} - w_{m+1}$ and $\operatorname{ord}\ell(s) = w_{m+1}$, we must prove that

$$\sum_{i=m+1}^{m+m_1} a_i \frac{\partial (f_\tau)_{\Delta_{\mathbf{w}}}}{\partial z_i}(\mathbf{a}) = 0. \tag{4.10}$$

To prove (4.10), we proceed as follows. The polynomial $(f_\tau)_{\Delta_{\mathbf{w}}}$ is weighted homogeneous with respect to the weights $\mathbf{w}$ and has weighted degree $d_{\mathbf{w}}$. Then, by the Euler identity, for any $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$ we have:

$$\sum_{1\leq i\leq n} w_i z_i \frac{\partial (f_\tau)_{\Delta_{\mathbf{w}}}}{\partial z_i}(\mathbf{z}) = d_{\mathbf{w}} \cdot (f_\tau)_{\Delta_{\mathbf{w}}}(\mathbf{z}). \tag{4.11}$$

As $f(\gamma(s)) = 0$ for any s, we have $(f_\tau)_{\Delta_{\mathbf{w}}}(\mathbf{a}) = 0$. Therefore, by (4.11),

$$\sum_{1\leq i\leq n} w_i a_i \frac{\partial (f_\tau)_{\Delta_{\mathbf{w}}}}{\partial z_i}(\mathbf{a}) = 0. \tag{4.12}$$

Combined with (4.5) and (4.7), the equality $o(s) = d_{\mathbf{w}} - w_{m+1}$ implies that for any $i > m + m_1$,

$$\frac{\partial (f_\tau)_{\Delta_{\mathbf{w}}}}{\partial z_i}(\mathbf{a}) = 0. \tag{4.13}$$

Indeed, if there were $i_1 > m + m_1$ such that (4.13) does not hold, then, by (4.5),

$$o(s) \leq d_{\mathbf{w}} - w_{i_1} \overset{(4.7)}{<} d_{\mathbf{w}} - w_{m+1},$$

which is a contradiction. As $w_i = 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$, it follows from (4.12) and (4.13) that

$$\sum_{i=m+1}^{m+m_1} w_i a_i \frac{\partial (f_\tau)_{\Delta_{\mathbf{w}}}}{\partial z_i}(\mathbf{a}) = w_{m+1} \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+m_1} a_i \frac{\partial (f_\tau)_{\Delta_{\mathbf{w}}}}{\partial z_i}(\mathbf{a}) = 0.$$

As $w_{m+1} > 0$, the equality (4.10) follows. This completes the proof.

Remark 4.1. In the above proof, we have assumed $I \neq \emptyset$ (i.e., $m \geq 1$). However, a straightforward modification shows that the argument still works when $I = \emptyset$. We just observe that, in this case, the face $\Delta_{\mathbf{w}}$ is compact, and hence, in (4.8), instead of the uniform local tameness, it suffices to invoke the non-degeneracy condition.

Remark 4.2. Note that in the special case where the functions f_t have an *isolated* singularity at the origin, we recover the Briançon assertion mentioned in the introduction (cf. Assertion 1.1). Indeed, in this case, as observed by Briançon in [1], by adding monomials of the form $z_i^{N_i}$ for large values of N_i, we may assume that f_t is *convenient*, that is, the intersection of the Newton boundary $\Gamma(f_t;\mathbf{z})$ with each coordinates subspace is non-empty. (In other words, the family of hypersurfaces $\{V(\tilde{f}_t)\}$ defined by the polynomial functions $\tilde{f}_t(\mathbf{z}) := f_t(\mathbf{z}) + c_1 z_1^{N_1} + \cdots + c_n z_n^{N_n}$ is Whitney equisingular if and only if the original family $\{V(f_t)\}$ is.) But for convenient polynomials, the only vanishing coordinates subspace is $\mathbb{C}^{\emptyset} = \{\mathbf{0}\}$, and by Remark 4.1, the partition

$$\{A_I\,;\, I \in \mathscr{I}_{nv}(f_0)\} \cup \{C_{\emptyset}\}$$

of $\mathscr{U} \cap V(f)$ is a Whitney stratification with the t-axis as a stratum if $\Gamma(f_t;\mathbf{z})$ is independent of t and f_t is non-degenerate.

5. Examples of admissible families

In this section, we give some examples of admissible (and therefore Whitney equisingular) families with non-isolated singularities.

5.1. **A family of curves with non-isolated singularities.** Consider the family given by the polynomial function

$$f(t,z_1,z_2) := z_1^2 z_2^3 + z_1^3 z_2^2 + t z_1^2 z_2^4.$$

Let $A = (2,3)$ and $B = (3,2)$. For t small enough, the singular locus of f_t in a sufficiently small open neighbourhood of the origin in $\mathbb{C}^2$ consists of the coordinates axes. The non-compact Newton boundary $\Gamma_{nc}(f_t;\mathbf{z})$, which is clearly independent of t, has one compact 1-dimensional face (namely, the face $\overline{AB}$), two 0-dimensional faces (A and B), and two essential non-compact faces: $\Xi_1 := B + \mathbb{R}_+\mathbf{e}_1$ and $\Xi_2 := A + \mathbb{R}_+\mathbf{e}_2$. We easily check that for each compact face Δ and each t, the face function $(f_t)_\Delta$ has no critical point on $(\mathbb{C}^*)^2$ (i.e., f_t is non-degenerate). We claim that for any $I \in \mathscr{I}_v(f_0) = \mathscr{I}_v(f_t)$, the family $\{f_t\}$ is uniformly locally tame along $\mathbb{C}^I$. Indeed, a trivial calculation shows that for any fixed $u_1 \in \mathbb{C}^*$, the function

$$z_2 \mapsto (f_t)_{\Xi_1}(u_1,z_2) := u_1^3 z_2^2$$

of the variable z_2 has no critical point on $\mathbb{C}^{*\{1,2\}}_{u_1}$. Similarly, for any fixed $u_2 \in \mathbb{C}^*$ with $|u_2| < 1/|t|$ (if $t \neq 0$), the function

$$z_1 \mapsto (f_t)_{\Xi_2}(z_1,u_2) := z_1^2 u_2^3 + t z_1^2 u_2^4$$

of the variable z_1 has no critical point on $\mathbb{C}^{*\{1,2\}}_{u_2}$. So we can take

$$r_{nc}(f_t) = \begin{cases} 1/|t| \text{ for } t \neq 0, \\ \quad \infty \text{ for } t = 0, \end{cases}$$

and we have $r_{nc}(f_t) > \rho := 1$ for all t with $|t| < 1$. It follows that the family $\{f_t\}$ is admissible.

5.2. **Families with "big" exponents for t-dependent monomials.** Let $h(\mathbf{z})$ be a polynomial function on $\mathbb{C}^n$ and let $g(t,\mathbf{z})$ be a polynomial function on $\mathbb{C}\times\mathbb{C}^n$. As usual, we write $g_t(\mathbf{z}) := g(t,\mathbf{z})$. Suppose that for all small t, $\Gamma_+(g_t;\mathbf{z}) \subseteq \Gamma_+(h;\mathbf{z})$ and $\Gamma_{nc}(g_t;\mathbf{z}) \cap \Gamma_{nc}(h;\mathbf{z}) = \emptyset$. Under this assumption, if h is non-degenerate and locally tame along the vanishing coordinates subspaces, then the family $\{f_t\}$ defined by $f_t(\mathbf{z}) := h(\mathbf{z}) + g_t(\mathbf{z})$ is admissible. For example, the family given by $f(t,z_1,z_2) := z_1^2z_2^3 + z_1^3z_2^2 + tz_1^3z_2^3$ is admissible.

5.3. **Admissible families and branched coverings.** Take a positive integer $p \in \mathbb{N}^*$, and consider the branched covering

$$\varphi^p\colon \mathbb{C}^n \to \mathbb{C}^n,\ (z_1,\dots,z_n) \mapsto (z_1^p,\dots,z_n^p),$$

whose ramification locus is given by the coordinates hyperplanes $z_i = 0$ ($1 \leq i \leq n$). In [11, Proposition 22], the second author showed that if $h(\mathbf{z})$ is a non-degenerate polynomial function which is locally tame along $\mathbb{C}^I$ for any $I \in \mathscr{I}_v(h)$, then $h^p(\mathbf{z}) := h\circ\varphi^p(\mathbf{z}) = h(z_1^p,\dots,z_n^p)$ is non-degenerate, $\mathscr{I}_v(h^p) = \mathscr{I}_v(h)$, and h^p is locally tame along $\mathbb{C}^I$ for any $I \in \mathscr{I}_v(h^p)$. Actually, the proof shows that if $\{f_t\}$ is an admissible family of polynomial functions, then so is the family $\{f_t^p\}$, where $f_t^p(\mathbf{z}) := f_t\circ\varphi^p(\mathbf{z})$. Indeed, it is not difficult to see that the independence of $\Gamma_{nc}(f_t;\mathbf{z})$ with respect to t implies that of $\Gamma_{nc}(f_t^p;\mathbf{z})$. Also, it is easy to check that $\mathscr{I}_v(f_t^p) = \mathscr{I}_v(f_t)$ and $\mathscr{I}_{nv}(f_t^p) = \mathscr{I}_{nv}(f_t)$. To see that f_t^p is non-degenerate, we argue by contradiction. Take any compact face $\Xi \subseteq \Gamma(f_t^p;\mathbf{z})$, and suppose there exists $\mathbf{a} := (a_1,\dots,a_n) \in (\mathbb{C}^*)^n$ such that

$$\frac{\partial (f_t^p)_\Xi}{\partial z_i}(\mathbf{a}) = 0 \tag{5.1}$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. Clearly, $(f_t^p)_\Xi(\mathbf{z}) = (f_t)_\Delta\circ\varphi^p(\mathbf{z}) = (f_t)_\Delta(z_1^p,\dots,z_n^p)$, where Δ is the compact face of $\Gamma(f_t;\mathbf{z})$ corresponding to Ξ—that is, if $\Delta\cap\mathbb{N}^2 = \{(\alpha_1,\alpha_2),(\beta_1,\beta_2),\dots\}$, then $\Xi\cap\mathbb{N}^2 = \{(\alpha_1^p,\alpha_2^p),(\beta_1^p,\beta_2^p),\dots\}$ (cf. Figure 2). Therefore, by (5.1),

$$\frac{\partial (f_t)_\Delta}{\partial z_i}(a_1^p,\dots,a_n^p)\cdot pa_i^{p-1} = 0,$$

and hence,

$$\frac{\partial (f_t)_\Delta}{\partial z_i}(a_1^p,\dots,a_n^p) = 0$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. This contradicts the non-degeneracy of f_t.

Claim 5.1. *The family $\{f_t^p\}$ is uniformly locally tame along the vanishing coordinates subspaces.*

Proof. By hypothesis, we know that the family $\{f_t\}$ is uniformly locally tame along the vanishing coordinates subspaces—that is, $r_{nc}(f_t) \geq \rho$ for all small t. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\rho < 1$. Consider a subset $I \in \mathscr{I}_v(f_t^p)$. For simplicity, let us assume that $I = \{1,\dots,m\}$. Let $u_1,\dots,u_m$ be non-zero complex numbers such that

$$|u_1|^2 + \cdots + |u_m|^2 \leq \rho^2.$$

Take any essential non-compact face $\Xi \in \Gamma_{nc}(f_t^p;\mathbf{z})$ such that $I_\Xi = I$, and consider the corresponding face $\Delta \in \Gamma_{nc}(f_t;\mathbf{z})$. (Note that $I_\Delta = I$ too.) We want to



FIGURE 2. A face $\Delta \subseteq \Gamma_{nc}(f_t;\mathbf{z})$ and its corresponding face $\Xi \subseteq \Gamma_{nc}(f_t^p;\mathbf{z})$

show that the face function $(f_t^p)_\Xi$ has no critical point on $\mathbb{C}^{*\{1,\dots,n\}}_{u_1,\dots,u_m}$ as a function of the variables $z_{m+1},\dots,z_n$. Again we argue by contradiction. Suppose $(u_1,\dots,u_m,a_{m+1},\dots,a_n)$ is a critical point. Then, for $m+1 \le i \le n$,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \frac{\partial (f_t^p)_\Xi}{\partial z_i}(u_1,\dots,u_m,a_{m+1},\dots,a_n) \\ &= \frac{\partial (f_t)_\Delta}{\partial z_i}(u_1^p,\dots,u_m^p,a_{m+1}^p,\dots,a_n^p)\cdot p a_i^{p-1}, \end{aligned}$$

and therefore,

$$\frac{\partial (f_t)_\Delta}{\partial z_i}(u_1^p,\dots,u_m^p,a_{m+1}^p,\dots,a_n^p) = 0. \tag{5.2}$$

As $\rho < 1$,

$$|u_1^p|^2 + \cdots + |u_m^p|^2 \le \rho^2,$$

and hence (5.2) contradicts the uniform local tameness of the family $\{f_t\}$. □

Altogether, the family $\{f_t^p\}$ is admissible.

REFERENCES

1. J. Briançon, "Le théorème de Kouchnirenko," unpublished lecture note.
2. C. Gibson, K. Wirthmüller, A. du Plessis, E. Looijenga, "Topological stability of smooth mappings," Lecture Notes in Mathematics **552**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1976.
3. A. G. Kouchnirenko, "Polyèdres de Newton et nombres de Milnor," Invent. Math. **32** (1976), no. 1, 1–31.
4. J. Mather, "Notes on topological stability," Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N. S.) **49** (2012), no. 4, 475–506.
5. J. Milnor, "Singular points of complex hypersurfaces," Annals of Math. Studies **61**, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, N. J., Univ. Tokyo Press, Tokyo, 1968.
6. M. Oka, "On the bifurcation of the multiplicity and topology of the Newton boundary," J. Math. Soc. Japan **31** (1979), no. 3, 435–450.
7. M. Oka, "On the topology of the Newton boundary III," J. Math. Soc. Japan **34** (1982), no. 3, 541–549.
8. M. Oka, "Canonical stratification of non-degenerate complete intersection varieties," J. Math. Soc. Japan **42** (1990), no. 3, 397–422.
9. M. Oka, "Non-degenerate complete intersection singularity," Actualités Mathématiques, Hermann, Paris, 1997.
10. M. Oka, "Non-degenerate mixed functions," Kodai Math. J. **33** (2010), no. 1, 1–62.

11. M. Oka, "On Milnor fibrations of mixed functions, a_f-condition and boundary stability," Kodai Math. J. **38** (2015) 581–603.
12. R. Thom, "Ensembles et morphismes stratifiés," Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **75** (1969) 240–284.
13. O. Zariski, "Some open questions in the theory of singularities," Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **77** (1971) 481–491.

C. EYRAL, INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, POLISH ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, ŚNIADECKICH 8, 00-656 WARSAW, POLAND
E-mail address: eyralchr@yahoo.com

M. OKA, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, TOKYO UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE, 1-3 KAGURAZAKA, SHINJUKU-KU, TOKYO 162-8601, JAPAN
E-mail address: oka@rs.kagu.tus.ac.jp